

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 3 through 6, 10 through 12, 14 through 17, and 21 through 23 are pending, with Claims 1, 12, and 23 being independent. Claims 2, 7 through 9, 13, and 18 through 20 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12, 14, 16, 17, and 23 have been amended.

Claims 1 through 23 yet again were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103 over previously-cited U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0028208 A1 (Ellis, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 12, and 23 recite, *inter alia*, conditioned access data generated by the broadcaster in accordance with (a) identification information for identifying the broadcast receiver, and (b) identification information for identifying an external terminal which is capable of connecting with the broadcast receiver without using the broadcasting system, both inputted from the external terminal to the broadcaster via a different network, with storing in advance the identification information for identifying the external terminal, and holding the identification information for identifying the broadcast receiver, with generation of display data for the external terminal responsive to the extracted identification information.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 12, and 23.

The Official Action states at page 2 that Ellis, et al. teaches the claimed features, citing “Fig. 2b; Para. 99; the remote program guide access device 24 inherently inputs a unique identification number for the receiver 22 to the broadcaster 16 so the receiver can receive the parental control settings, conditional access data, to watch the program”. Applicants respectfully traverse this statement. Inherency requires that the cited document invariably and necessarily

disclose the claimed features which, in Applicants' view, is not the case — indeed, the cited sections of Ellis, et al. are manifestly silent at least as regards the above-discussed claimed features.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Rejection is an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, and is believed to clearly place this application in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that a full appreciation of these amendments will not require undue time or effort given the Examiner's familiarity with this application. Moreover, this Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants earnestly believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/mcm

FCHS_WS 1867726v1